

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant adds new claims 27-28 by this Amendment.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0105016 (hereinafter, "Sasaki") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,862,103 (hereinafter, "Miura"). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Miura and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,381,163 (hereinafter, "Yokoyama"). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Miura and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0162695 (hereinafter, "Shiraiwa"). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Miura, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0051230 (hereinafter, "Ohta"), and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0190400 (hereinafter, "Redd"). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Miura, and Redd. Claims 7-12 and claims 13-18 are rejected for reasons similar to those presented for claims 1-6. Claims 19-21 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki, in view of Miura and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,661,987 (hereinafter, "Anderson"). Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Miura and further in view of Yokoyama and U.S. Patent No. 6,778,698 (hereinafter, "Prakash"). Applicant submits the following in traversal.

Rejection of claims 1, 3 under §103(a) over Sasaki in view of Miura

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable because a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established. Applicant submits that Sasaki in view of Miura fail to teach or suggest, inter alia:

sequentially dividing inputted image data into small blocks of image data, each having a data volume according to the characteristics of an image process to be performed,

sequentially performing an image process on said small blocks of image data to sequentially obtain processed small blocks of processed image data,

and sequentially outputting said processed small blocks of processed image data to an output device which is separate from an apparatus performing said image process.

In the Office Action, the Examiner argues that the processing of the single pixel block or the multi-line blocks in Sasaki correspond to the claimed sequentially performing the image process. The Examiner, however, concedes that Sasaki fails to disclose sequentially outputting as recited in claim 1, but argues that Miura discloses such a feature at column 14, lines 6-19. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant submits that claim 1 recites sequentially outputting said processed small blocks of processed image data to an output device, in combination with other elements of the claim. The processed small blocks of processed image data are obtained by sequentially performing an image process on said small blocks of image data and the small blocks of image data are generated by sequentially dividing inputted image data into small blocks of image data, each having a data volume according to the characteristics of an image process to be performed.

To the contrary, there is nothing in Miura which teaches or suggests that Miura's disclosure of "sequentially output[ting] by the printer" would be done in single pixel blocks or multi-line blocks. See col. 14, lines 15-17. Although Miura apparently discloses that the printer outputs sequentially, there is nothing regarding how the printer receives the print data, i.e., how print data is outputted to the printer.

Rather, Miura suggests that the entire print data is first stored in the print spool and, then, transmitted to the printer. See col. 14, lines 17-18 (disclosing steps S801 to S803 which are repeated until the entire print data is received); and col. 14, lines 45-49 and Fig. 1 (explaining and showing that the received data is stored in a print spool of the print output unit 103, before sending to printer 104).

Simply put, the Examiner is improperly pointing out sections of Sasaki and Miura allegedly corresponding to the elements of claim 1, in a piecemeal fashion without taking into account the context of the individual claim elements.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable for at least the reasons submitted above.

Claim 3, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1.

Rejection of claim 2 under §103(a) over Sasaki in view of Miura and Yokoyama

Rejection of claim 4 under §103(a) over Sasaki in view of Miura and further in view of Shiraiwa

Rejection of claim 5 under §103(a) over Sasaki in view of Miura, Ohta and Redd

Claims 2, 4 and 5, which depend from claim 1, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Yokoyama, Shiraiwa, Ohta and Redd fail to make up for the deficiencies of Sasaki and Miura.

Rejection of claim 6 under §103(a) over Sasaki in view of Miura and Redd

Claim 6, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Redd fails to make up for the deficiencies of Sasaki and Miura.

In addition, Applicant submits that claim 6 is additionally patentable because Redd fails to teach or suggest a method wherein a determination is made as to whether or not the image process dependent on the output device is valid or not, based on the characteristics of the input destination of the inputted image data and the output characteristics of the output device.

Nowhere in Redd is there any mention of the determination as claimed.

Rejection of claims 7-12 and claims 13-18 for reasons similar to those presented for claims 1-6

Applicant submits that claims 7-12 and 13-18 are patentable for reasons similar to those submitted for claims 1-6.

Rejection of claims 19-21 and 22-24 under §103(a) over Sasaki in view of Miura and further in view of Anderson

Claims 19-21 are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Anderson fails to make up for the deficiencies of Sasaki and Miura.

In addition, Applicant submits that claim 20 is patentable because Sasaki, Miura and Anderson fail to teach or suggest a method wherein the first processing is x direction enlargement and the second processing is y direction enlargement. Although Anderson discloses

the horizontal line processor 45 and the vertical line processor 49, there is nothing to suggest that these processors would process the lines of the inputted image data as claimed. Rather, it is entirely feasible that each of the horizontal and the vertical line processors 45 and 49 process one entire image data at a time, instead of processing the image data in portions thereof.

Applicant also submits that claim 21 is patentable because Anderson fails to teach or suggest a method wherein the first processing is color space conversion and the second processing is resolution conversion. Although the Examiner cites “elements 43 and 45” of Fig. 3, there are no such elements in Fig. 3. Instead, Fig. 3 merely shows a frame memory system.

Claim 22 is patentable for reasons similar to those submitted for claim 1.

Claims 23-24 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 22.

Additionally, claims 23 and 24 are patentable for reasons submitted for claims 20 and 21.

Claims 25 and 26 under §103(a) over Sasaki in view of Miura and further in view of Yokoyama and Prakash

Claims 25 and 26, which depend from claim 1, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Yokoyama and Prakash fail to make up for the deficiencies of Sasaki and Miura.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO.: 10/078,499

ATTY DOCKET NO.: Q66587

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Susan V. Pan
Registration No. 41,239

Date: April 12, 2007